REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 7, 14 and 15 are present in this application, claims 16-19 being canceled by way of the present amendment. Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), claims 1, 7, 14 and 15 are rejected over U.S. Patent No. 7,194,196 (Yamamoto et al.) and U.S. Patent No. 5,990,955 (Koz); claims 16 and 17 are rejected over Yamamoto et al., in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,296,187 (Shearer) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,292,610 (Toida et al.); and claims 18 and 19 are rejected over Yamamoto et al. and Koz and further in view of Toida et al.

Claim 1 is amended to recite a control unit which varies a storing method according to the first or second type of expansion information for synchronism playback on the basis of a data description language contained in the expansion information, and claim 7 is amended to recite a storing method which is varied according to the first or second type of expansion information for synchronism playback on the basis of a data description language contained in the expansion information. Support for the amended claims is provided, for example by the shared buffer (audio commentary buffer/audio buffer) 2098 shown in Fig. 18. Page 62, lines 15-20 describes buffer manager 204 switching the storage method of buffer 2098. As described on page 27, lines 5-14, buffer manager 204 sends buffer control for loading data in accordance with an instruction from an ENAV document. See page 9, line 23 - page 10, line 14 describing how the ENAV document is included in the expansion information and the ENAV document is described in a Markup/Script language. No new matter is believed to be added.

Turning to the prior art rejections, the apparatus of claim 1 having the recited control unit is not disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art. As a non-limiting example, shared buffer 2098 is described in detail in the specification, page 57, lines 24 through page 60, line 4. As described in this portion of the specification, the shared buffer 2098 comprises audio

buffers A and B. When the shared buffer 2098 serves as an audio commentary buffer, the audio buffers A and B serve as two buffers. On the other hand, when the shared buffer 2098 serves as an audio buffer, the audio buffers A and B serve as a single, large buffer. More specifically, when the storage unit stores a first type of expansion information, it serves as an audio commentary buffer (a plurality of buffers). When the storage unit stores a second type of expansion information, it serves as an audio buffer (a single buffer). The control unit corresponding varies the storage method of the storage unit in accordance with a type of data and thus the storage unit stores data by different storage methods in accordance with a type of data.

In contrast, Yamamoto et al. discloses an apparatus including a VBV buffer 87, a sub picture buffer 89 and an audio buffer 92. The VBV buffer 87 is merely a buffer exclusively for video data, the sub picture buffer 89 is merely a buffer exclusively for sub picture data, and the audio buffer 92 is merely a buffer for audio data. Yamamoto et al. simply discloses an apparatus including three independent buffers for storing data items of three types. Yamamoto et al. does not disclose an apparatus as recited in claim 1 where the control unit varies a storing method according to first or second types expansion information on the basis of a data description language contained in expansion information.

Koz is relied upon for segmented memory spaces. The FIFOs in Fig. 4 are not integrated but rather "see-saw." Further, there is no suggestion in Koz to vary a storage method according to first or second types expansion information on the basis of a data description language contained in expansion information. Claim 1 is patentable over a combination of Yamamoto et al. and Koz.

In claim 7, a storing method is varied according to the first or second type of expansion information for synchronism playback on the basis of a data description language contained in the expansion information. Referring to the descriptions above of Yamamoto et

al. and Koz, there is no such method disclosed or suggested by a combination of these two references. Claim 7 is also patentable over a combination of Yamamoto et al. and Koz.

With the cancellation of claims 16-19, the rejections including Shearer and Toida et al. are moot.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Eckhard H. Kuesters
Registration No. 28,870

Carl E. Schlier
Registration No. 34,426
Attorneys of Record

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)